

Ryan C. Bundy
ID No. 79400-065
Nevada Southern Detention Hearing
2190 Ease Mesquite Avenue
Pahrump, Nevada 89060

In Propria Persona, Sui Juris

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | § | CASE #: 2:16-cr-00046-GMN-PAL |
| | § | |
| Plaintiff, | § | DEFENDANT RYAN BUNDY'S |
| | § | AMENDED WITNESS AND EXHIBITS |
| Vs | § | LIST |
| | § | |
| RYAN C. BUNDY | § | |
| | § | |
| Defendant | § | |

COMES NOW, the defendant, Ryan C. Bundy-In Propria Persona-Sui Juris hereby moves this Honorable Court to except this revised list of witness, videos & audios, pictures and documents pulled together under the most arduous of condition.

I apologized to the court for being late, but as the court is aware, I have been locked up in prison and have no reasonable access to prepare a defense. I understand the Court has some presumption that I have availability to tools to prepare my defense that I do not have.

I provided a audio which has graciously been transcribed that states some of the difficulties, I am up against trying to prepare a defense as a pre-trial detainee. This was recorded by Mr. Bailey, who is assisting me, and then transcribed by Mr. Roy Plum, who did transcription in the military.

Please this as an explanation explaining the tardy response to the Governments response.

[Unofficial transcription by Roy H. Plumb from audio below]

[True and correct transcription to the best of transcriber's ability]

[The comment [U/I] means Unintelligible]

[BEGINNING OF RECORDING]

RYAN BUNDY: Dan, how are you?

DAN H. BAILEY: Good, Ryan. Did you find that?

RYAN BUNDY: I... I... I did find the document, and, uh, I did write a little thing. I just wrote it once. I haven't proofed it or typed it or anything else, so it's [U/I]

[VOICE OVERLAP]

DAN H. BAILEY: That's fine. OK.

RYAN BUNDY: All right. The document number is 1254 and it's referencing, um, our court... No, it's referencing a number 1033, um, it's also referencing document 1044.

DAN H. BAILEY: OK.

RYAN BUNDY: All right. All right. This is what I wrote. All right. You want to record it?

DAN H. BAILEY: Yeah, I'm going to... I'll do that and, um, let me look at it, yeah, I've got it. OK. I went around and around over that looking for it. Go ahead. We're ready. [CLEARS THROAT]

RYAN BUNDY: All right. It says, uh... I wrote: "The court had document 1254, asserts that I have all the... the needed, uh, tools to prepare a defense and have denied my motion, document, uh, 1044 to have contact visits with my defense team, and blocking me from pri... privileged phone calls and other tools for my defense. Whereas there are quite a few computers at this facility, there are still many difficulties, uh, in their use. CCA has 17 computers [CLEARS THROAT] in the law library. Supposedly, we can use them for... for a total of 21 hours each week, but that time is divided between all the G units, of which there are four, each housing up to 96 men, 384 in total. The law library time begins at 5:30 am and ends at 6:30 am, then begins at 7:30 am, then ends at 10:30 am, then begins at... again at 1:30 pm, then ends at 2:30 pm. From those times, um, one must subtract the time to be, uh, searched each time both ways coming and going, time to arrange your papers on the desk only to gather them up and have to leave again real soon, time interrupted to be counted, and sign in and sign out of the library, uh, no liberty to use the restroom except by appointment and accompaniment of the jail staff, and searches again each way, time wasted, um, requesting and... and waiting for our electronic storage devices or, uh, to be delivered each way, being that we are not allowed to carry our own, uh, the one computer in G-2 unit, which is where I am housed, does not have the same operating system and program as the... the... the computers in the library and will not, um, open the discovery that, uh, I have been given, uh [U/I]

RECORDING: This call is from an inmate facility.

RYAN BUNDY: [U/I] continuity of work cannot be, [SIGHS] cannot be, uh, cannot occur because of the differences of the program. G-4, where Ammon, my brother, is housed, has no computer. G-2's computer is divided between 96 men and it is difficult to, uh, spend the needed time on it without interfering with someone else's, um... The lights in G-2 are kept off until lunch hour in the morning, and off again at 9:30 pm at night, interrupting reading and study time. Count times, um... uh, of which there are four, one at 9:00 am, one at 1:00 pm, one at 4:00 pm, and one at 7:00 pm, each of which are for one hour, plus or minus, which no computer time can be had during those... during those four hours each day. Uh, communication between my paralegals and investigators is hindered extremely. Instead of being able to share documents, discovery and legal re... uh, resources, and second, um, to collaborate our work through the Internet, it takes days to get these things in and out through the mail or through physical delivery,

both subject to search and scrutinizing examinations. Standby council assigned to me by the government with my con... without my consent or input is not sufficient, uh, assistance of counsel as I see fit. I have a right to assistance of counsel, which I have retained and used, uh, by choosing who will assist me and by whose council I deem valuable. Not just anybody is sufficient to fulfill my needs." Anyway, that's all I've written, so...

DAN H. BAILEY: Very good. OK. Um, yeah, that'll... I'll get that transcribed and... and, um, put that in the...

RYAN BUNDY: So I... I should go into, you know, um, uh, it's... how difficult it is for our papers. I mean, I've got stacks of stacks of papers, no filing system, uh, you know, without staples, granted, we do have some staples in here, which is better than other places, but I still have stacks and stacks of papers that are not stapled, um, no filing, you know, no... no file folders, no... no cabinets, and so it's... so it's just extremely difficult to get through, or to keep... to keep any order, any semblance of order amongst our paperwork, um, that ought to be added in there. Um, and storage of those too, uh, you know, given some boxes, which is again better than other places I've had and yet still, just stacking stuff in boxes instead of a filing cabinet or system, um, you know, desk and chairs, you know, uh, are... are not had readily available, and, you know, I sit hunched over on my bed, which my back ends up hurting after reading too long. Anyway, so there's lots of difficulties.

DAN H. BAILEY: OK. Now you... you lost some books and things during transports, too. You might mention that.

RYAN BUNDY: Yes, I did. I... I, [SIGHS] I believe... I... I... I... At the time, I believed that I couldn't bring all of that stuff, uh, and, uh, I kind of found out later that I probably could have brought more than what I [CLEARS THROAT] I did. Um, and so I left a lot of it behind, either that or sent it... sent it out, or sent it home. Um, but I did lose a few documents in tran... in transit, with the stuff I did bring.

DAN H. BAILEY: OK, and Judge Brown gave you a book and that was lost in the shuffle in the trial... in the court...

RYAN BUNDY: It was in the courtroom, you know, and I tried to get Angela... Or, uh, Lisa Lukewood to get that, you know, to me, which she never did.

DAN H. BAILEY: OK. And one of the things you might talk about is the amount of detention time you've been in, particularly early on.

RYAN BUNDY: Well, I can tell you that I've spent nearly 100 days of this 365 that I'm darn near to, uh... uh, almost 100 days in solitary confinement, which... of which...

RECORDING: This call is from an inmate facility.

RYAN BUNDY: ...locked down for, uh, nearly 23 hours a day, some of it for 23 hours and 45 minutes a day, but most of it was for about 24 hours a day, or 23 hours a day. And... and, uh, of course... Well, and I guess that all pertains to this trial too because I wasn't able to prepare.

DAN H. BAILEY: Well, and, when you were transferred here, approximately how long? Uh, I know you were through the two... two... two, initial hearing and the detention hearing, the Fareta hearing, both those periods of time, you were in the, uh... uh, conference [U/I] conference that you were... where the case was declared conflict, you were during... in solitary during that time, weren't you?

RYAN BUNDY: Yes. And that's, you know, that's one reason why I was unable to have an evidentiary hearing back then, is I... How am I supposed to gather evidence and prepare when I'm locked down 23 hours a day and the one hour that I was out was at midnight, 11:00 to midnight?

DAN H. BAILEY: OK, and how many days did that go on when you were down in Nevada?

RYAN BUNDY: The whole time I was here, plus, you know, it... I was... I was in, uh...

DAN H. BAILEY: Oh, that's right, you...

RYAN BUNDY: {U/I} for about four days prior, then I come down here. I was down here for like 13 days, I was in that condition the entire time and then when I went back up to MCDC, they put me back in that condition up there for another couple of weeks.

DAN H. BAILEY: OK. So the whole in your pretrial here in Nevada, you were in, uh, solitary?

RYAN BUNDY: Yes.

DAN H. BAILEY: And you, uh, were you able to receive communication from your attorney, your standby attorney?

RYAN BUNDY: He came one time.

DAN H. BAILEY: OK. Well, I think we've hit the... hit the important parts, Ryan.

RYAN BUNDY: OK.

DAN H. BAILEY: If you think of anything else, we can always add to it.

RYAN BUNDY: All right.

DAN H. BAILEY: Any... any word from... No... no word...

[END OF RECORDING]

As you can see from the above dialog I do not have access to the tools reasonably necessary to defend myself.

It the very least I need a legal runner that can get documents in and out each say I need them, not a week or two later as the current practice is with Ms. Dowes.

Moving on the instant action is analogous to the following case; **in that it is a pure fabrication and misrepresentation of the truth, start to finish!**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. CLIVEN BUNDY, et al: the facts and evidence (as distinguished from attorney opinion and conclusions) **IS ALL A SERIES OF FABRICATED LIES TO ADVANCE A POLITICAL AGENDA!**

The object of these oppression of the Bundy family and other farmers and ranchers to aimed at suppressing access to public land, suppressing freedom of speech and freedom to assemble to object to federal government over reach; and is all lies analogous to:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. HUDSON, Case 2:13-cr-00126-ODW Document 112 Filed 03/10/14; wherein the Honorable Otis D. Wright, II—United States District Judge wrote the ORDER dismissing the Indictment for outrageous Government

conduct. Following is excerpts of the Honorable Judge Wright's ORDER:

“Lead us not into temptation,” Judge Noonan warned. *United States v. Black*, 733 F.3d 294, 313 (Noonan, J., dissenting). But into temptation the Government has gone, ensnaring chronically unemployed individuals from poverty-ridden areas in its fake drug stash-house robberies. While undoubtedly a valid law-enforcement tool when employed to target or prevent demonstrated criminal enterprises, reverse stings offend the United States Constitution when used solely to obtain convictions.

The Court is mindful that fighting crime is undoubtedly an arduous task that the Executive Branch must endure. But as James Madison wrote in *The Federalist* No. 51,

If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.

The only way to effectively control the Government in this case and effectuate the due process that the Constitution demands is to dismiss this indictment which the ATF obtained against Defendant Antuan Duane Dunlap through outrageous government conduct. For the reasons discussed below, the Court accordingly GRANTS Dunlap's Motion to Dismiss the Indictment. (ECF No. 92.) Dunlap shall be RELEASED from custody FORTHWITH barring any other holds.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

To catch individuals suspected of engaging in home-invasion robberies, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (“ATF”) Special Agent Dan Thompson masquerades as a “cocaine courier who wishes to steal the cocaine he is expected to deliver” from a location in the Los Angeles area. (Aff. ¶ 4.) Special Agent Thompson, consistent with previous ATF reverse-sting operations, paints a picture of an all-too-easy stash-house robbery. He tells unwitting individuals a tale of bountiful harvests of 20 to 25 kilograms of “pure” cocaine being guarded by just a few individuals. **The only problem: it's all a lie.** [Bolding and underling added]

V. CONCLUSION

The Court is mindful of the Supreme Court's admonition in *Russell*: the federal judiciary does not have “a ‘chancellor's foot’ veto over law enforcement practices of which it did not approve. The execution of the federal laws under our Constitution is confided primarily to the Executive Branch of the Government, subject to applicable constitutional and statutory limitations and to judicially fashioned rules to enforce those limitations.” 411 U.S. at 435. The Executive Branch's enforcement obligation is certainly a difficult one, as people will always find new ways of evading law-enforcement detection and carrying out their criminal enterprises. This ever-shifting landscape demands that law-enforcement agencies employ creative tactics to ferret out crime and keep society safe.

But it is not the role of the Judicial Branch to merely rubberstamp whatever imaginative device the ATF and other agencies [i.e. Bureau of Land Management (BLM)] dream up. Rather, it is the duty of the courts “to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void.

Without this, all the reservations of particular rights or privileges would amount to nothing.” The Federalist No. 78 (Alexander Hamilton).

The time has come to remind the Executive Branch that the Constitution charges it with law enforcement—not crime creation. A reverse-sting operation like this one transcends the bounds of due process and makes the Government “the oppressor of its people.” 733 F.3d at 318 (Noonan, J., dissenting). **In this case, the Constitution will not tolerate subjecting an individual to prosecution for an imaginary crime subject to a very real punishment—a punishment which rests entirely on ATF agents’ whims.** Since it is the Court’s sworn duty to uphold the Constitution, the Court GRANTS Dunlap’s Motion to Dismiss the Indictment. (ECF No. 92.) Dunlap shall be RELEASED from custody FORTHWITH barring any other holds.

IT IS SO ORDERED. Otis D. Wright, II—United States District Judge

In the instant action and upcoming hearing, the burden is on the Government to prove three different points:

- That there are sufficient facts, as distinguished from opinions, conclusions and fantasized by an Government prosecutor carrying out the will of his master without “probable cause” a crime had been committed by defendant Ryan C. Bundy.
- There are sufficient facts (distinguished from opinions, conclusions and puffing) that defendant Ryan C. Bundy is a flight risk. What facts exist that a man born and raised locally all his 45 years? Growing up on the same land that his ancestors settled in eighteen-seventy-seven (1877) is not something a man of high morals, integrity and character will leave. What facts does the Government have that support the bare assertion that Ryan C. Bundy would flee, abandoning his family, a loving wife and eight children and the home of his ancestors?
- Are there any sufficient facts (*distinguished from opinions and conclusions*) to prove Ryan C. Bundy was and is a danger to the community? Defendant asserts that the Government is acting in bad faith, in alleging there is a factual basis under the bail reform act as a legal basis to assert Ryan C. Bundy has ever been convicted of violent crimes or has probable cause to believe defendant is a danger to another person; public or private?
- Defendant demand the right of confrontation to be able to confront is accuser and to

cross him under oath.

- There was no assault!
- There were no threats to Federal Officers.
- Ryan C. Bundy did not refuse to obey court orders; the fact is, he was never a party or subject to a court order.
- Defendant Ryan Bundy was not physically present through most of the protest.
- Ryan C. Bundy did not brandish a weapon at a federal officer as alleged.
- Ryan C. Bundy and the Bundy family did not dis-respect local law enforcement; to the contrary, they worked with and cooperated with local law enforcement.
- The Bundy family issue is not with the United States Government; rather their issue rests solely with the federal overreach of the BLM.
- There is not factual basis to allege Ryan C. Bundy or any of the Bundy family and their supporter charged in this case is a danger to the community.

“The Government bears the burden of showing by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant poses a flight risk, or by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant poses a danger to the community.” (United States v. Montamedi, 767 F.2d 1403, 1406)

RYAN C. BUNDY’S PROFFER OF EVIDENCE

| EXHIBIT # | PICTURES (PICS) TO REBUT LIES & FALSE STATEMENTS: | POINTS & EVIDENCE INTENDED TO REBUT LIES & FALSE STATEMENTS |
|-----------|---|--|
| PIC1 | <p>REBUT LIES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That “<i>defendant [R. Bundy] and Ammon Bundy, led the armed assault . . .</i>”. (4/20/ 16, Transcript, Pg. 14, ln. 3-4) 2. “. . . that defendant [R. Bundy] was a leader. (April 15 2016-Transcript pg. 15, ln. 9) was a lead an “assault” on “federal officers.” 3. The law enforcement officer at there was not assault on Federal | <p>PIC1: Picture 1 is a picture of Ryan exiting a squad car of Mark McEwen who had been working with the Bundy’s throughout the week leading up to the final protest and the wash.</p> |

| | | |
|------|---|---|
| | Officers. | |
| PIC2 | <p>REBUT LIE:</p> <p>The statement “[t]his Superseding Indictment resulted from a massive armed assault against federal law enforcement officers . . .”. [SSI, pg. 2, ¶1]</p> <p>“Thereafter, R. BUNDY assumed a leadership role in ensuring that the officers left the Impound Site quickly organized the Follower to release the cattle.” (SSI, pg. 35, ln. 22-24)</p> <p>“So the defendant was a leader.” (April 20, Detention Hearing Transcript, pg. 15, ln. 9)</p> | <p>PICTURE TWO: shows the first people in the protest that arrived at the fence set up by the BLM on the City of Mesquite Land. Note, neither Ammon or Ryan lead the (alleged assault) which was merely a civil protest. Note also the protest was not held on the USA land as alleged in the indictment.</p> |
| PIC3 | <p>REBUT LIE:</p> <p>The statement “Cliven Bundy stayed up there. But his sons, the defendant [Ryan Bundy] and Ammon Bundy, led the armed assault that occurred thereafter.” (April 20, Detention Hearing Transcript, pg. 14, ln 2-4)</p> | <p>PIC3: Is a picture clipped from VID1 (infra) that shows the first protestors and camera men arriving at the fence that had been put up a a barricade. The point of the picture clipped from VID2 is that clearly Ammon and Ryan are not leading an armed assault by the militia. Clearly neither defendant nor any armed militia are on the picture. None the men in this picture were armed excepted with cameras.</p> <p>Mark McEwen is expected to testify that the time he and Ryan arrived at the protest things were winding down, and that contrary to the fanciful story portrayed by the Government, Ryan had an alibi defense and could not have lead “massive assault” as opined in the SSI. [SSI, pg. 2, ¶1]</p> |
| PIC4 | | <p>PIC4: A PICTURE WORTH A 1000 WORDS!</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>What this picture shows is RESPECT! To men (Ammon Bundy and Deputy Clarke County Sheriff's Deputy Robert Thomas) locking arms through the fence, both with clear respect for each other. Note Deputy Thomas was in standard uniform, not body armor (a peace officer) and not also the unhappy expression of Special Agent In Charge (SPC) Dan Love in heavily armed in full body armorer.</p> |
| | | |
| | | |
| AUDIO & VIDEOS THAT REBUT LIE AND FALSE STATEMENTS | | |
| VID1 | <p>VIDEO REBUTS LIE:</p> <p>Rebuts several of the false allegations including the following lies: made by Nicholas D. Dickerson in the April 20th 2016 Detention Hearing where in he made himself the only testifying witness falsely accusing:</p> <p>1. <i>"R. Bundy along with his brothers led the assault at the impound site, delivered the Bundy family's demands that BLM leave immediately, and announced to the Bundy follows that "the west has now been won!" as the BLM prepared to leave."</i> The only portion of this statement that is true I the quote <i>"the west has now been won!"</i> Dkt. 1157, pg. 7 ln. 3-6)</p> <p>2. <i>"Mr. Bundy was a leader in the assault and the conspiracy surrounding that assault, both before the impound . . . [and] on the day of the 12th, the sort of climax of the charges in this case . . ."</i></p> | <p>This video prepared by Michal Lynch and posted on YouTube at: was posted on</p> <p>VIDEO: This video was downloaded from YouTube.com and is perhaps the best video of what the Government calls an "assault" and clearly shows this was in fact not an assault, rather it was civil protest the overreach of the federal government.</p> <p>Additionally the video shows the respect and cooperation with local law enforcement, specifically the Clarke County Sheriff the Las Vegas Metro Police Department.</p> <p>This video will also prove beyond a doubt that Ryan and Ammon Bundy were not leading a heavily armed "militia" and</p> <p>This video will also show there was a peaceful resolution worked out with the protestors and the</p> |

| | | |
|------|--|---|
| | <p><i>“Officers at the gate were dangerously exposed. They were in the open on low ground at the bottom of the wash, below highway bridges that towered more than 40 feet above them and surrounded on the sides by steep embankments of high ground. The terrain acted like a funnel with them at the bottom and no natural cover or concealment to protect them from the gunmen on the high ground, their only protection being their body armor and the vehicles they happened to drive to the gate. At this point, approximately 40 Followers were either carrying or brandishing firearms in front of the officers in the wash while more than 20 of them carried or brandished firearms in the bridge. . . . The observed armed gunmen dressed in military style tactical gear and wearing body armor, moving in and among the unarmed Followers, using them as human shields to mask their movements while still others took tactically superior over-watching positions on the sides of the wash.”</i> (SSI, Dkt, #27, pg. 32, ¶135)</p> | <p>local law enforcement.</p> <p>Further, it shows there was not “. . . armed gunmen dressed in military style tactical gear and wearing body armor, moving in and among the unarmed Followers, using them as human shields . . .” as alleged, that the BLM actually held the high ground with Sniper on the ridge behind and above them.</p> |
| VID2 | <p><i>“The charges included assault with a deadly weapon on a federal law enforcement officer, threatening a federal law enforcement officer, obstructing of justice, extortion of federal officers, and use and brandish a firearm in relation to a “crime of violence”¹.</i></p> <p><i>“Mr. Bundy was a leader in the assault and the conspiracy surrounding that assault, both before the impound . . . [and] on the day of</i></p> | <p>VIDEO 2: is also a video much the same as above, yet this one is taken from the bottom of the Wash as the camera man walked behind and filming the advancing crowd and also walking along the opposite side from the camera that took VIDEO 1. This also has a close up of the exchange between defendant Ryan Bundy’s brother Ammon and SPC Love. Both video one and two clearly show this was a spontaneous protest that</p> |

¹ **Crime of Violence.** United States v. Johnson, --- F.Supp.3d ---- (2016) found the definition of “crime of violence” was unconstitutionally vague.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <i>the 12th, the sort of climax of the charges in this case . . .”.</i> | had not been preplanned and none of the Bundy men lead to so called assault. |
| VID3 | <p>This short video provides clear documentation when defendant Ryan Bundy was supposed to be leading a assault on federal officers he was on the caught on police camera walking along the freeway and waving to the officer in the patrol car.</p> <p><i>“Mr. Bundy was a leader in the assault and the conspiracy surrounding that assault, both before the impound . . . [and] on the day of the 12th, the sort of climax of the charges in this case . . .”.</i></p> | VIDEO 3: This clip shows Ryan Bundy waking along the freeway walking up and past a patrol car that videoed his approach. Again rebuts the false allegation (lie) that Ryan Bundy lead the assault. At the early stage of the so called assault he was up on the freeway and not down leading in the draw. |
| VID4 | <p>REBUT THE FACTICY ALLERGATION THAT MILITIA CAMPS WERE SET UP AND THE IMPLICATION SOME HOW THEY WERE COMMITTING A CRIME.</p> <p><i>“Militia camps were set up where people that came down for that specific purpose, who were armed could camp separate and away from individuals that just came to, you know, express their displeasure with BLM.”</i></p> | <p>Sheriff Joe Lombardo, who was a Deputy Sheriff throughout the Bundy events in Bunkerville, was on a interview of sheriff candidates as was specifically asked about whether is was time to remove the militia.</p> <p>When asked if it was time to remove the Militia, his response was paraphrased:</p> <p>No, they broke no laws, they were on private property and there was no lawful basis to arrest them or move them out.</p> |
| DOCUMENTS (DOC)THAT REBUT LIES OR FALSE ALLERGATIONS | | |
| DOC1 | <p>REBUTS THE ASSERTION:</p> <p>Ryan C. Bundy poses any substantial risk or danger to the community.</p> | <p>DOC1: Clearly shows the defendant Ryan C. Bundy criminal history has all-ready been determined that it does not support a finding that he does not pose a substantial risk or danger to the community.</p> <p><i>“Defendant has significate family</i></p> |

| | | |
|------|---|---|
| | | <p><i>and community ties in Nevada. He has a history of employment. Although he has a prior criminal record, by itself would not support a finding that the Defendant poses a substantial risk or danger to the community.” (USDC, District Nevada, Doc. #298, p 2, ¶2)</i></p> |
| DOC2 | <p>REBUTS MAGISTRATE GEORGE FOLEY JR. “Alternative Findings (B) in pertinent part:</p> <p><i>“It does indicate, however, that Defendant will not obey court orders.” (United States District Court, District of Nevada, Detention Order, Dkt 298, pg, 2, (2))</i></p> | <p>ORDER 1998.</p> <p>First, we do not have a copy of this order, however it is safe to say that (<i>and a proffer of proof made herein</i>) the ORDER did not name Ryan C. Bundy, thus again he was not subject to the ORDER.</p> <p>Second, the validity of this order is summarized in a letter from Keith G. Munro, Assistant Attorney General, State of Nevada directed to Amy Lueders, Bureau of Lan Management, Nevada State office. In this letter he states in relevant part:</p> <p><i>“We do not see anything the Permanent Injunction Order approving seizer of Mr. [Cliven] Bundy’s cattle. Based in the clear language of NRS 565.125, the Department and its brand inspectors may not issue clearance certificates or permits to remove any cattle seized by BLM on allegation of trespassing without presenting the Department a court order that confirms assents to or sanctions seizure of the cattle, obtained prior to seizure thereof. The Permanent Injunction Order does not satisfy the requirement of NRS 565.125. Sincerely,</i> <i>CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO,</i> <i>Attorney General, signed by Keith</i></p> |

| | | |
|------|---|--|
| | | <p><i>G. Munro, Assistant Attorney General.</i></p> <p>How can Ryan C. Bundy be held in violation of such a ORDER that he is not subject too?</p> |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| DOC3 | <p>REBUTS FALSE ALLERGATION REGARDING VIOLATION COURT ORDER:</p> <p><i>“The court orders issues by this court, three of them at least, have not been enforced, are still flagrantly veng violated. And the defendant has made no indication that he would not do what he’s continued to do, which is disagree with those court orders, not by protesting but by taking up arms and interfering with them.” (4/20/16, Transcript, p17, ln. 20-25)</i></p> | <p>COURT ORDER: United States District Court, District of Nevada, USA v Bundy, 02:98-cv-532-LRH-VCH. This was a civil case closed in 1998 and reopened in 2013. A new ORDER, dkt # 35 referenced an order dated November 3, 1998. The 1998 ORDER was regarding the Bunkerville Allotment was signed July 07, 2013 illegally extended the 1998 order that the statute of limitations had run. Ryan C. Bundy was not a party to that order, nor was he named in the order <u>thus he was not subject to that order.</u></p> |
| DOC4 | <p>REBUT THE LIE:</p> <p><i>“The Superseding Indictment resulted from a massive armed assault against federal law enforcement officers that occurred in and around Bunkerville, Nevada, on April, 2014. The defendants named herein planned, organization, led, and/or participation as gunmen in the assault, all on order to threaten, intimidate, and <u>extort the officers into abandoning approximately 400 head of cattle that were in their</u></i></p> | <p>COURT ORDER:</p> <p>A SECOND ORDER: was issued on October 09, 2013. United States District Court, District of Nevada, 02:98-CV-00531-LRH-VCH, dkt #56. Again as in the previous ORDER, <u>it did not name Ryan C. Bundy as a party or name his as being subject as a party; thus he was not subject to this ORDER.</u></p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | <u><i>lawful care and custody.</i></u> ” (SSI, Dkt. 27, pg. 2,, ¶1) | |
| DOC5 | | <p>A THIRD ORDER:</p> <p>A third order was filed out of the United States Court of Appeal No. 13-16623, filed January 30, 2014 dismissing appeal. Again in this order Ryan C. Bundy was not a party, did</p> |
| TESTIFYING WITNESSES (TW) | | |
| TW1 | REBUT LIE: Mark McEwen - A Las Vegas Metro Police Department officer serving in the Bunkerville Nevada on April 12, 2014 | <p>Officer McEwen is expected to testify as an alibi witness in that during the beginning and up to the final negotiation between the protestor’s Clarke County Sheriff’s Department, and the as Vegas Metro Officers on site that rebut the false accusation of the Government.</p> |
| TW2 | REBUT LIE: The Ryan Bundy and his family and the Militia were a danger a the community, Clarke County Deputy Sheriff (then candidate for Sheriff) Joseph Lombardo has some very revealing comments on an a live television candidate night interview. | <p>Sheriff Joseph Lombardo - Current Clark County, Nevada sheriff who was at the time of the protest was the Under Sheriff to Sheriff Gillespie.</p> <p>Then Under Sheriff, Lombardo was on site working directly with R. Bundy, having first hand intimate knowledge of the events surrounding the protest.</p> <p>Additionally, Sheriff Lombardo was interacting with the Bundy’s and Militia at the (private) Bundy Ranch headquarters and was asked in an interview on Fox News was it time to move the militia out of Bunkerville. Sheriff Candidate Lombardo replied:</p> |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| | | <p>“No, um, let me put it this way, how can we move the Militia out, you now, is it a violation of the First Amendment, by moving them, they are all on private property ok, huh, the property owner have given them the ability to be there, huh they are not violating any laws associated with their believes, so where is the authority come from to remove them? (Taken from Video WYP?. Joe Lombardo, Candidate for Clark County Sheriff) [Have been unable to confirm the date, this was aired.]</p> |
| TW3 | <p>REBUT LIE:</p> <p>“R. Bundy along with his brothers led the assault at the impound site, delivered the Bundy family’s demands that BLM leave immediately, and announced to the Bundy follows that “the west has now been won!” as the BLM prepared to leave.” The only portion of this statement that is true I the quote “the west has now been won!” Dkt. 1157, pg. 7 ln. 3-6)</p> <p>2. “Mr. Bundy was a leader in the assault and the conspiracy surrounding that assault, both before the impound . . . [and] on the day of the 12th, the sort of climax of the charges in this case . . .”.</p> <p>“Officers at the gate were dangerously exposed. They were in the open on low ground at the bottom of the wash, below highway bridges that towered more than 40 feet above them and surrounded on the sides by steep embankments of high ground. The terrain acted like a funnel with</p> | <p>Officer Brett Empy - Las Vegas Metro Police Department officer serving in the Bunkerville Nevada area on the day of April 12, 2014. Officer Empy, was present and with Ryan during part of that time, and has personal and intimate knowledge of the events of that day, was frequently present and in communication with Ryan in the days and weeks following April 12 dealing with him on 12th on the bridge and extended communication.</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | <p>them at the bottom and no natural cover or concealment to protect them from the gunmen on the high ground, their only protection being their body armor and the vehicles they happened to drive to the gate. At this point, approximately 40 Followers were either carrying or brandishing firearms in front of the officers in the wash while more than 20 of them carried or brandished firearms in the bridge. . . . The observed armed gunmen dressed in military style tactical gear and wearing body armor, moving in and among the unarmed Followers, using them as human shields to mask their movements while still others took tactically superior over-watching positions on the sides of the wash.” (SSI, Dkt, #27, pg. 32, ¶135)</p> | |
| TW4 | <p>REBUTS LIE:</p> <p>1. <i>“On April, 2nd, As set forth in the indictment, the defendant went to a sale barn in Richfield, Utah, where they had learned, had contracted with the BLM to take the cattle once the BLM had impounded them. Not only – they just didn’t stand outside and protest this, they actually barged in, caused a disruption, shut down the auction.</i></p> <p><i>The sheriff had to be called.”</i> (4/20/16 Transcript, pg. 10, ln. 11-18)</p> <p>2. <i>“. . . [D]isruption of a Richfield, Utah sale barn that had contracted with the BLM to auction the impoundment cattle . . .”. (EDCN, 16-00046, Dkt. 1157, pg. 6, ln. 14-17)</i></p> | <p>Utah County Sheriff, Nathan Curtis, is Sevier County, Utah Sheriff, and the one who jurisdiction included the location at Richfield, Utah. He or has deputies would have taken reports or responded to the calls from the Auctioneer or Auction Yard staff, when Ryan is alleged to have caused the interruption.</p> |
| TW5 | <p>REBUTS LIE:</p> <p><i>“. . . [D]isruption of a Richfield, Utah</i></p> | <p>Jerusha Bundy, daughter of Ryan Bundy. Jerusha Bundy was with</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | <p><i>sale barn that had contracted with the BLM to auction the impoundment cattle . . .</i>". (EDCN, 16-00046, Dkt. 1157, pg. 6, ln. 14-17)</p> | <p>her father when he went into the sale barn and sat down beside his brother in law Steve Stoddard, thus she had first hand there was not disruption at the sale barn.</p> <p>Additionally Steve Stoddard Ryan's brother in law, was at the sale that day and witness there was no disruption. Mr. Stoddard was not put on the supeona list but is going to be in the Detention Hearing an could be called from the audience to testify.</p> |
| TW6 | <p>REBUTS LIE:</p> <p><i>" . . . [D]isruption of a Richfield, Utah sale barn that had contracted with the BLM to auction the impoundment cattle . . .</i>". (EDCN, 16-00046, Dkt. 1157, pg. 6, ln. 14-17)</p> | <p>Steve Stoddard, is Ryan Bundy's Brother In Law and was at the sale barn, watching the Auction, when defendant Ryan Bundy and daughterJerusha, sat down beside Stoddard and watched the auction and when the owner-auctioneer did not break defendant Bundy and daughter left without incident.</p> |
| TW5 | <p>REBUTS LIE:</p> <p><i>" . . . disruption of a Richfield, Utah sale barn that had contracted with the BLM to auction the impoundment cattle . . .</i>". (EDCN, 16-00046, Dkt. 1157, pg. 6, ln. 14-17)</p> | <p>Angie Bundy, Wife and Character Witness. Angie is Ryan Bundy's and mother of Ryan's eight (8) children and wife of 22 years. Angie knows Ryan like no one else. She is also a witness that attended the protest both days (one week apart) at the Utah Auction Yard.</p> |
| TW6 | <p>REBUTS FINDING:</p> <p>That finding that Ryan was a flight risk and a danger to the community.</p> | <p>Shem Teerlink, Character Witness. A native of Bunkervill, NV and life long neighbor to Ryan C., Bundy and the entire Bundy family.</p> |

| CHARACTER WITNESSES (CW) LETTERS ATTACHED ² | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| A | Character Witness Letter | Angela Bundy |
| B | Character Witness Letter | Donna McGinnis |
| C | Character Witness Letter | Ned Milkkelsen Cox |
| D | Character Witness Letter | Liilie Spencer |
| E | Character Witness Letter | Brooke Bundy Fortenberry |
| F | Character Witness Letter | Angie Houston |
| G | Character Witness Letter | Aaron Teerling |
| H | Character Witness Letter | Marjorie Holt |
| I | Character Witness Letter | Cassie Christenson |
| J | Character Witness Letter | Heidi Pearson |
| K | Character Witness Letter | Lynn Brown |
| L | Character Witness Letter | Patricia Aiken |
| M | Character Witness Letter | Phillip O. Jensen |
| N | Character Witness Letter | Merion Belen |
| O | Character Witness Letter | Bob and Helen Corbi |
| P | Character Witness Letter | Jacen Brewer |
| Q | Character Witness Letter | Oregon Character Letter Compilation (some duplicates and/or originals of prior letters) |

DATED: January 27, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ryan C. Bundy

In Propria Person-Sui Juris

² Filed separately under seal pursuant to LR IA 10-5 and the case-specific Protective Order filed as ECF No. 609 (i.e. information contains personal identifiers)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I Ryan C. Bundy certify that on _____, a copy of the following document(s) was {served/electronically} filed as follows:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

Via the CM/ECF system, which will automatically serve a Notice of Electronic Filing and/or by:

- ☐ by certified U.S. mail, return receipt requested # _____
- ☐ by U.S. mail placed in Postal Box at: _____
- ☐ by personal delivery by {my agent}: _____
- ☐ by fax to {fax number} at {time}: _____
- ☐ by common-carrier delivery by {identify type of delivery service, e.g., FedEx, UPS}: _____
- ☐ by e-mail to {e-mail address} _____ at {time} _____
- ☐ by the following agent/assistant for Defendant, Ryan C. Bundy:

/s/ Ryan C. Bundy
Ryan C. Bundy
In Propria Persona-Sui Juris

I certify that Angela H. Dows, Standby Counsel/Assistant for Ryan C. Bundy is a registered CM/ECF user and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

/S/
Angela Dows, Esq.
Standby Counsel for Ryan C. Bundy
133 North Buffalo Drive, Suite 210